(5,467,388) under 35 U.S.C. § 102. Applicants respectfully traverse.

Claim 1 includes a step of, inter alia, generating a virtual telephone number via the telecommunication service after activating the telecommunication service.

Redd, Jr. et al. does not teach the referenced step.

Redd Jr. et al. speaks about a "virtual number", for example in col. 11, line 60 and col. 12, line 23. The number is characterized as being a "virtual number" because it is used for solving and administering the call blocking service, but it must not be connected with a real connection location (see col. 11, lines 60 ff). The virtual number thus exists prior to the activation of the service.

In the presently disclosed invention, the virtual number is converted into a connection set-up to any number of end subscribers (notification). Specifically, the virtual number is generated only after the service is activated as defined in claim 1.

Claim 11 includes means for generating a virtual telephone number via the telecommunication service after activating the telecommunication service. Redd, Jr. et al. does not disclose

any such means as should be evident from the discussion given above with regard to claim 1.

Claim 12 includes a switching point for transmitting a virtual telephone number from a service provider to initiate the telecommunication service after an occurrence of an event. Redd, Jr. et al. does not disclose any such device as should be evident from the discussion given above with regard to claim 1.

In item 8 on page 4 of the Office action, claims 9 and 10 have been rejected as being obvious over Redd, Jr. et al. (5,467,388) under 35 U.S.C. § 103. Applicants respectfully traverse.

Claims 9 and 10 are patentable for the reasons specified above with regard to claim 1.

Additionally, Redd, Jr. et al. describe how the (blocking) service is activated by a subscriber. However, one of ordinary skill in the art knows that several subscribers can have this service activated "at the same time." The difference with respect to the claimed invention, however, is that in Redd, Jr. et al., the services are activated, deactivated and administered independently of each other. As

soon as subscriber A administers the call blocking service, it does not have any effect on subscriber B.

In the method described in the present application, there is a connection, because subscriber B, who was simultaneously registered for the service, also receives a notification when a notification is being generated for subscriber A.

For example, claim 10 specifies that, after initiation of the telecommunication service, actions are carried out for all the telecommunications subscribers who have activated the telecommunication service.

It is accordingly believed to be clear that none of the references, whether taken alone or in any combination, either show or suggest the features of claims 1, 11, or 12. Claims 1, 11, and 12 are, therefore, believed to be patentable over the art and since all of the dependent claims are ultimately dependent on claim 1, they are believed to be patentable as well.

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration and allowance of claims 1-12 are solicited.

In the event the Examiner should still find any of the claims to be unpatentable, he is respectfully requested to telephone

counsel so that, if possible, patentable language can be worked out.

Petition for extension is herewith made. The extension fee for response within a period of two-months pursuant to Section 1.136(a) in the amount of $410.00 in accordance with Section 1.17 is enclosed herewith.

Please charge any other fees which might be due with respect to Sections 1.16 and 1.17 to the Deposit Account of Lerner and Greenberg, P.A., No. 12-1099.

Respectfully submitted,

Mark P. Weichselbaum
Reg. No. 43,248

For Applicants

MPW:cgm

January 10, 2003

Lerner and Greenberg, P.A.
Post Office Box 2480
Hollywood, FL 33022-2480
Tel: (954) 925-1100
Fax: (954) 925-1101